



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

it is exactly because such erroneous inferences have been made that the mental phenomena of the child have been misunderstood and misinterpreted, and that psychology has not received the benefit of the correction which a faithful observation of them would have furnished. It was the physiologist who, by a careful observation of the lower animals, "having entered firmly on the true road, and submitting his understanding to things," arrived at generalisations which were found to explain many of the mental phenomena of the child, and which have furthermore thrown so much light upon the mental life of the adult. The careful study of the genesis of mind is as necessary to a true knowledge of mental phenomena as the study of its plan of development confessedly is to an adequate conception of the bodily life."

These few passages may suffice to indicate the direction in which Dr. Maudsley's method tends, whose excellent work, which has already become standard, we most urgently recommend to the careful study of all those who are interested in the physiology and pathology of the brain.

---

## RESUMÉ OF THE "BULLETINS" OF THE PARIS ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

(From June 1867, to January 1868.)

By E. VILLIN, F.A.S.L., F.R.S.L.

---

THE Paris Society has published its labours, during the half-year ending December, 1868, in two numbers of "Bulletins," which we had promised to review ever since their publication; but the multiplicity of matters which this *Review* has had to deal with, has, until the present time, prevented us from fulfilling this pleasurable duty.

Anthropological labours in Paris are quite as interesting to us as the labours performed by the English Society. It is, however, impossible to give our readers a complete report, and we may be excused for only giving short abstracts of researches and papers, to which a complete translation alone could do justice, so replete with facts and matter are they. We therefore advise those students of anthropology, who desire to see the progress that this science has been making everywhere, to read the French "Bulletins" themselves, and we promise them to be amply repaid for the trouble; for, as Horace has it, "*Est operæ pretium.*"

In a short but learned paper, called "Phases Sociales," M. Letourneau, after a survey of the different races of man inhabiting the globe, comes to a conclusion with which we entirely agree; namely, that "individually and collectively man passes through a series of phases

succeeding and producing one another ; that at first—a being purely and simply *nutritive*—he becomes specially *sensitive*, then *moral*, and lastly *intellectual*. . . . The man in whom nutritive wants predominate, is at the bottom of the scale ; and the man who has moral and, above all, intellectual wants, stands at the summit of civilisation ; whilst the man whose wants are *sensitive*, stands in the middle of the social scale. But, adds M. Letourneau, humanity has not anywhere, as yet, attained the *intellectual* point. The man in whom all these aptitudes, all these wants would be coexisting—with no other differences than those of energy—would be, would constitute complete man."

M. Lagneau, in a learned paper on the "Anthropology of France," carefully reviews the types of nearly every province of the French empire. For this the author has consulted the best writers, and has availed himself of the observations made everywhere by the "Conseils de Révision" on the yearly military recruiting ; he also made many observations himself, and this contribution to the science of man seems altogether reliable. But it is too full of particular details for us to attempt to give an analysis of it ; we must therefore refer our readers to the original itself. One fact, however, we must not pass unnoticed : M. Lagneau insists upon the importance of studying the idioms and *patois* of various departments, some of which, as M. de Ranse has proved, directly descend from the original settlers.\*

Dr. Destruges, of Guayaquil, on sending to the Paris Society a human head beautifully mummified, still ornamented with its flowing black hair, but reduced by an artificial process, after death, to the size of a small ape's head, also sent some information as regards the means employed by the Indians to obtain this curious result. As this subject has not yet been treated scientifically by English anthropologists, we shall give M. Destruges' letter in full :—

"The process through which the *Jibaros* reduce in size, and preserve for a very long time, the heads of their enemies killed in war, is no longer a mystery. They roll the leaves of a plant (to us unknown) into a ball, and this ball is heated to an elevated temperature by a gentle fire, until the external surface presents an almost incandescent aspect. This incandescent ball is then introduced into the soft parts of the head, by that time already separated from the bones of the skull. The soft parts immediately shrink, and receive from the burnt leaves antiseptic and preserving principles. It is these soft

\* The Reviewer knows of a village in the Marne department, called *Courtisols*, where the *patois* is absolutely unintelligible to all the surrounding villages ; and there is a tradition in the place which, wrongly or rightly, makes the *Courtisols* a small colony of Huns, who remained there after Attila had been defeated a few miles off.

parts, dried and reduced in size, which the Indians call *chauca*. Upon festival occasions, they carry these *chauchas* dangling from the ends of their lances, and they relate the history and the exploits of the victim whose head now hangs from their weapons."

Are there no botanists who could tell us the name of the plant unknown to M. Destruges? and are there no anthropologists who could use the same means for preserving dead remains? We are fully aware that these mummies are deprived of those characteristics in feature and measurements which alone have any value in the eyes of students; but, at the same time, there are occasions when travellers can have no better means (the plant being known) of bringing specimens home; and when their object is merely to preserve tendons, muscles, or fibres, in their right position in nature, a reduced specimen may be well worth preserving. A traveller cannot possibly bring home, from Central America or Central Africa, a single bulky specimen in spirit of wine; whereas he could, with facility, pack many dry and reduced specimens that, in this shape, would be eagerly studied by the students at home. At a time when the subject of the Jivaro Indian head was comparatively new in England, a paper was published, in 1862, by Don Ramon de Silva-Ferro. This, however, does not give us the method of preservation, which Dr. Destruges has above described.

M. Bouvier has a short paper on "Comparative Craniology of Man and Animals," which led him to the same conclusion as that arrived at by Gratiolet,—“that, whilst admitting that the nervous apparatus, which pervade the cortical substance, have a limited and localised repartition; admitting, also, that special aptitudes can result from them in diverse individuals, I believe that every part of the cerebral envelope equally participates in the power of thought.”

M. Kopernicki, of Bucharest, has sent the description of a new Craniograph. This instrument, if well used, gives the measurements of contours with a mathematical accuracy; but it requires experience and time on the part of the craniologist. In spite of this drawback, its results are such that we wonder that the London Society should have delayed the acquisition of this beautiful instrument so long. Perfect accuracy, we must always bear in mind, can alone insure anthropology success.

“Polyzoism” is the title of a most interesting paper by M. Durand (de Gros). If the author of the contribution can establish his theory, it will undoubtedly be a revolution in science of immense importance: for it would reverse what has been considered almost a dogma for a long period. The conclusions of M. Durand, after enumerating his facts, are these:—

“Physiology, medicine, psychology, and morals have agreed, until the present day, in regarding man as a *unity*,—a unity, living, feeling, and thinking, entirely compact and irreducible, as an animated and *simple* body; and, upon this first and common belief, all their dogmatical and practical institutions were framed. However, new facts seem now to demonstrate that this belief is an error; that the human being is, in reality, a collection of organisms, a collection of lives and distinct “ego’s”, and that its apparent unity lies wholly in the harmony of a hierarchical *ensemble*, the elements of which, connected by a narrow coordination and subordination, yet carry, each in itself, all the essential attributes, all the primitive characters of the individual animal. Such a system is, doubtless, alarming for a vast system of established ideas and things; but let us follow it in its consequences, and we shall be convinced that, if it *destroys*, it also *builds*, and that its work, full of positive truths, is a thousand times preferable to the scaffolding of illusions to which this work will be substituted.”

These views created quite a sensation in the Paris Society; and M. Dally, one of its most brilliant members, acknowledged that M. Durand’s views upon the multiplicity of centres of vital action really deserved the most serious meditations. “Without being able,” said he, “to form as yet an opinion upon their accuracy, I seize this opportunity for supporting his critique, as regards the *abyss* which, according to some naturalists, separates the invertebrates from the vertebrates. The idea that these two branches are constructed on a different plan, whilst evidently the functions are the same, the organic elements are identical, is based upon the sole difference that the apparatus are more or less perfect. Nervous system, circulation, digestion, locomotion, in the two branches, have everything in common; and we can establish the most rigorous analogies between the apparatus, even if we had not the *Amphioxus* and its fossil congeners. I then ask where the abyss is, since we have a ganglionic chain, and the cephalic ganglions of the annulosa, the vertebral channel of the crustaceans, and the pulmonary respiration of the arachnids, etc., etc., to bring against the organic systems of the vertebrates? It would be high time to renounce these pretended abysses, when everything can show or prove, even in the entire modern fauna, incomplete as it is, a more or less, but an undeniable series.”

A very animated discussion, full of interest, was caused by a paper upon “The Proportions of the Body according to Races,” by Dr. Weisbach. This discussion was carried on by the best Paris Anthropologists to great lengths, and we advise our London students to read it with care. The observations of Dr. Weisbach bear upon ten races,

and he has come to certain conclusions, which were not unanimously accepted, after comparing these races with the Europeans. "The greatest propinquity with the conformation of the anthropomorphic apes indicating the most inferior degree of the human race, we must conclude that the race which possesses the largest amount of simian proportions upon the greatest number of parts of the body, must be the most inferior. Yet we feel embarrassed to give an answer, because in the small number of points upon which we can make a comparison between man and the orang, *the simian resemblance is in no wise exclusively concentrated in ONE race; but it divides itself, as to the different parts, amongst the different races, and this so effectually that there remains to each a lesser or greater share of this parental inheritance. Even we, Europeans, cannot pretend to have entirely severed ourselves from this parentage*; witness the shortness of our hand relatively to our arm, and amongst the Slavons and Roumans, the great length of the fore-arm relatively to the arm?

"On examining the different races enumerated from this point, we see that none is completely deprived of dimensions of certain parts which reapproach it nearer to the type of the orang more than the others. The Javanese and Madurians are favoured, because they approach it by the smallest number of points. . . . Whereas the Australian presents the most numerous simian similarities,—in the length of the feet, the smallness of the legs, the broad nose and mouth, the elongated arm, the broad feet, and the thin calves."

MM. Pruner-Bey, Alix, Rochet, Broca, Gavarret, Giraldés, Dally, Pouchet, Bertillon, and de Bligroières, we repeat, discussed this subject in a very scientific and almost exhaustive manner; and, in our opinion, the discussion by far surpasses the paper which caused it in importance. It is given *in extenso* in the "Paris Bulletins," and we regret not to be able now to translate it for the benefit of all our readers.

M. Broca has a Paper on the *Relative Proportions of the Superior and Inferior Limbs amongst the Negroes and the Europeans*, which, like every contribution from that *savant*, is quite an Anthropological treat, for it is full of measurements and facts masterly classified. We consider this paper as an excellent sequel to Dr. Weisbach's, above mentioned. The results arrived at by M. Broca are summed up thus:—

"1. The length of the superior limb, compared to that of the inferior, is less in the negro than in the European. In this the Negro is further from the simian type than the European.

"2. The length of the humerus compared with that of the femur, or with that of the inferior limb, is also less in the Negro, who, in this again, is more removed from the simian type than the European.

"3. The length of the humerus, compared to that of the radius, is much less in the black than in the white. This character brings the Negro nearer to the ape.

"4. The excess of length of the radius in the Negro, compared to the humerus, partly depends upon the shortness of the humerus, but not exclusively. The radius of the Negro is, in fact, longer than that of the white man, when it is compared with the inferior limb.

"5. The superior limb of the Negro, therefore, presents two opposite characters: for whilst, on the one hand, by the length of the radius, the Negro is nearer than the European to the simian type; he, on the other hand, is removed from it by the shortness of the humerus."

These intercrossings are not rare in the different races; they constitute facts little favourable to the idea that all the types of humanity are derived from one type, and they appear to M. Broca to give their testimony in favour of the opinion of the polygenists.

Other subjects, such as Languages, the Age of Stone, Miocene Man, Man during Geological times, and a great variety of skulls and bones, form a series of papers which we strongly recommend to the attention of the student of Anthropology; but we, unfortunately, cannot, for want of space, give any abstract of them. There is, however, a series of contributions on "Civilisation," and "Religions as bearing on Civilisation," which we had promised ourselves to succinctly analyse, so masterly were these subjects treated by MM. Letourneau, Condereau, Pellarin, and Bataillard, from different points of view; but we must forego this duty until the next number of this *Review*. We might say that these questions hardly belong to Anthropology, and this view was at first taken by the Paris Society; but, upon reconsideration, they resolved to give full scope to them, and with a tolerance which we commend to the example of the London Society, five or six learned treatises were read, discussed, and published, mostly upon religion. "A human produce," says M. Bataillard, "which has contributed to civilisation, has had all sorts of influences, and which the man of science, unless he be afraid of fanatics in all countries, cannot ignore, pass by, and treat as if it did not exist. We should therefore study it under all its aspects, as we study politics, art, or literature, since, like these, it contributed—although sometimes in a deplorable manner—to the development of mankind."

We really do not see why the English Society, living as it does in the midst of a tolerant people, Protestants, should be less tolerant than its Paris sister Society. We are convinced that, provided the discussion should be conducted with the same amenity of language as distinguishes our neighbours, no single Fellow of the Anthropological Society of London would at any time object to such important matters being brought under his notice.

---